arXiv:math/9709201v1 [math.CV] 30 Sep 1997

ON A DOMAIN IN $\mathbb{C}^2$ WITH GENERIC PIECEWISE SMOOTH LEVI-FLAT BOUNDARY AND NON-COMPACT AUTOMORPHISM GROUP

Siqi Fu and Bun Wong

§1. Introduction.

In this paper, we continue our investigation of domains with non-compact automorphism groups in [FW]. We shall prove the following:

Main Theorem. *If D is a simply-connected domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ with generic piecewise smooth Levi-flat boundary and non-compact automorphism group, then D is biholomorphic to the bidisc.*

The boundary bD of a bounded domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n$ is called *piecewise smooth* if there exists a neighborhood U of $\overline{D}$ and $\rho_k \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(U)$, $1 \le k \le m$, such that $D = \{q \in U;\ \rho_k(q) < 0, 1 \le k \le m\}$ and $d\rho_{k_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge d\rho_{k_l} \neq 0$ on $\cap_{j=1}^{l} S_{k_j}$ for any distinct $k_1, \ldots, k_l \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, where $S_j = \{q \in U;\ \rho_j(q) = 0\}$. It is called *generic piecewise smooth* if $\partial\rho_{k_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \partial\rho_{k_l} \neq 0$ on $\cap_{j=1}^{l} S_{k_j}$. The boundary bD is called *(generic) piecewise smooth Levi-flat* if each S_j is in additional Levi-flat (See Section 3). We will call $\{\rho_j;\ \ 1 \le j \le m\}$ a *defining system* of D and each S_j a *defining hypersurface* of D.

When D is convex, the above result was obtained by K.-T. Kim [Kim1] (see [W2] for related results). Kim's proof uses a refine version of the rescaling method introduced by Frankel [Fra]. It was proved by Pinchuk [P] that a homogeneous bounded domain with piecewise smooth boundary is biholomorphic to a product of balls. Note that the non-compact condition in the above theorem is weaker than the homogeneous condition in Pinchuk's result. In the latter case, one can choose a special boundary accumulation point that has properties similar to those possessed by a strictly pseudoconvex boundary point. See [Kod1, 2] and [CS] for results along this line. We remark that the simply-connected condition on D cannot be dropped. For example, the product of a disc and an annulus has generic piecewise smooth Levi-flat boundary and non-compact automorphism group. However, it is not biholomorphic to the bidisc. For motivation and background on the subject, we refer readers to [W1,2], [R], [GK1-3], [BP1,2], [Kim1,2], [FIK], and references therein.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 32A07; secondary 32H05, 32M05.

Typeset by $\mathcal{AMS}$-TEX

Acknowledgment: The first author thanks Professors H. Boas, S. Krantz and E. Straube for their supports. He is especially thankful to Professor E. Straube for stimulating conversations on the subject.

§2. Preliminaries.

Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let Δ be the unit disc and Δ^n the unit n-polydisc. Let $H(D_1, D_2)$ be the family of holomorphic mappings from D_1 to D_2. Let $T(D)$ be the holomorphic tangent bundle of D. we will identify $T(D)$ with $D \times \mathbb{C}^n$.

The Kobayashi-Royden metric $F^K_D\colon T(D) \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ is defined by

$$F^K_D(z, v) = \inf\{1/\lambda; \quad \text{there exits } f \in H(\Delta, D) \text{ with } f(0) = z,\ f'(0) = \lambda v,\ \lambda > 0\ \}$$

for $(z, v) \in T(D)$.

For $f(z) = (f_1(z_1, \dots, z_n), \dots, f_m(z_1, \dots, z_n))$, we denote by $f'(z)$ the $m \times n$ Jacobian matrix $(\partial f_j / \partial z_k)$. The Eisenman-Kobayashi measure on D is defined by

$$M^E_D(z) = \inf\left\{\frac{1}{|\det f'(0)|^2};\ f \in H(\Delta^n, D), \quad f(0) = z\right\}.$$

The Carathéodory measure M^C_D on D is defined by

$$M^C_D(z) = \sup\{|\det f'(z)|^2;\ f \in H(D, \Delta^n), \quad f(z) = 0\}.$$

We list some well-known properties of the Kobayashi-Royden metric and the invariant measures.

Lemma 2.1. *Let D, D_1 and D_2 be bounded domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$.*

(1) If $f \in H(D_1, D_2)$, then $F^K_{D_1}(p, v) \ge F^K_{D_2}(f(p), f_{*p}(v))$ for $(p, v) \in T(D_1)$.

(2) If $f \in H(D_1, D_2)$, then $M_{D_1}(z) \ge M_{D_2}(f(z))|\det f'(z)|^2$, where M_D is either of the invariant measures.

(3) Let $\pi\colon D_1 \to D_2$ be a covering mapping, then $F^K_{D_1}(z, v) = F^K_{D_2}(\pi(z), \pi_*(v))$ and $M^E_{D_1}(z) = M^E_{D_2}(\pi(z))|\det \pi'(z)|^2$.

(4) $M^E_D(z) \ge M^C_D(z)$ for all $z \in D$. If $M^E_D(z_0) = M^C_D(z_0)$ for some $z_0 \in D$, then D is biholomorphic to Δ^n.

For more information on invariant metrics and measures, we refer readers to [Kob], [Kr], [GW1,2], and [JP].

Let $\Gamma_\theta = \{re^{i\alpha}; \quad r > 0,\ \pi - \theta < \alpha < \pi + \theta\}$ be the cone with vertex at the origin and angles between its edges and the negative $\operatorname{Re} z$-axis θ. Let $\Delta(a, r)$ be the disc with center a and radius r. Let $\Delta_\epsilon = \Delta(0, \epsilon)$ and $\Gamma^\epsilon_\theta = \Gamma_\theta \cap \Delta_\epsilon$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let θ_1 and θ_2 be two numbers such that $0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \pi$. Let $z_j = r_j e^{i(\pi+\alpha_j)}$, $-\theta_1 < \alpha_j < \theta_1$, be a sequence in Γ_{θ_1}. Suppose that $z_j \to 0$ and $\alpha_j \to \alpha < \theta_1$. Then for any positive numbers ϵ_1 and ϵ_2,*

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \frac{M_{\Gamma_{\theta_1}^{\epsilon_1}}(z_j)}{M_{\Gamma_{\theta_2}^{\epsilon_2}}(z_j)} = \left(\frac{\theta_2 \cos \frac{\alpha\pi}{2\theta_2}}{\theta_1 \cos \frac{\alpha\pi}{2\theta_1}} \right)^2$$

where M is either of the invariant measures.

Proof. Note that in this case the two invariant measures are identical. In fact, they are the square of the Poincaré metric in the unit direction. Using the conformal mapping

$$z \mapsto \left(\frac{1 + i\left(-\frac{z}{\epsilon}\right)^{\pi/2\theta}}{1 - i\left(-\frac{z}{\epsilon}\right)^{\pi/2\theta}} \right)^2$$

that maps Γ_θ^ϵ onto the upper-half plane and the explicit formula for Poincaré metric of the upper-half plane, one obtains by straight-forward but tedious calculations that for $z = re^{i(\pi+\phi)}$ with $-\theta < \phi < \theta$,

$$M_{\Gamma_\theta^\epsilon}(z) = \frac{1}{\left(\theta \cos \frac{\pi\phi}{2\theta}\right)^2} \cdot \frac{\pi^2 \left(1 + (\frac{r}{\epsilon})^{\frac{\pi}{\theta}} - 2(\frac{r}{\epsilon})^{\frac{\pi}{2\theta}} \sin \frac{\pi\phi}{2\theta}\right)\left(1 + (\frac{r}{\epsilon})^{\frac{\pi}{\theta}} + 2(\frac{r}{\epsilon})^{\frac{\pi}{2\theta}} \sin \frac{\pi\phi}{2\theta}\right)}{4r\left(1 - (\frac{r}{\epsilon})^{\frac{\pi}{\theta}}\right)^2}.$$

The lemma then follows from the above formula. □

§3 Levi-flat hypersurfaces.

Let S be a smooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let ρ be a defining function for S, *i.e.*, there exists a neighborhood U of S such that $\rho \in C^\infty(U)$, $S = \{z \in U;\ \rho(z) = 0\}$, and $d\rho(z) \neq 0$ on S. The hypersurface S is called *pseudoconvex* if the Levi-form

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_k}(z) X_j \bar{X}_k \geq 0$$

for all $z \in S$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_j}(z) X_j = 0$. It is called *Levi-flat* if the "$\geq$" sign in the above inequality is replaced by the "$=$" sign.

It is well-known that a Levi-flat hypersurface is locally foliated by complex manifolds of codimension 1 (cf. [Fre]). In particular, if S is a Levi-flat hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and $p \in S$, then there exists a neighborhood U of p and a diffeomorphism $g_t(\zeta) = g(t,\zeta)\colon (-1,1)\times\Delta \to S\cap U$ such that $g_t(\zeta)$ is holomorphic in ζ. Each open Riemann surface $g_t(\Delta)$ is a leaf of the foliation. The following lemma shows that if S contains an affine disc, then one can piece together the local foliations to obtain a foliation of S in a neighborhood of any smaller disc of the given disc. Since we cannot find a reference for such a result, we provide the details of the proof, which is inspired in part by the work of Barrett and Fornæss [BaF].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $M = \Delta \times \{0\}$ and let S be a Levi-flat hypersurface containing M. Then for any δ with $0 < \delta < 1$ there exists a neighborhood N_δ of $\Delta_\delta \times \{0\}$ and a diffeomorphism*

$\Phi(t,\zeta)$ from $(-1,1)\times\Delta_\delta$ onto $S\cap N_\delta$ such that $\Phi(t,\zeta)=(\zeta,\varphi(t,\zeta))$ where $\varphi(t,\zeta)$ is holomorphic in ζ and $\varphi(0,\zeta)=0$ for $\zeta\in\Delta_\delta$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 8 in [DF] (see Lemma 3.3 below) that after a change of coordinate system in a neighborhood of M, the real normal of S is constant on M. Assume that the normal direction is the positive real $\operatorname{Re} w$-direction. Then S is given in a neighborhood of $\Delta_\delta\times\{0\}$ by

$$\operatorname{Re} w + r(z,\bar z,\operatorname{Im} w)=0 \tag{2.1}$$

where $|r(z,\bar z,\operatorname{Im} w)|\le C|\operatorname{Im} w|^2$ for some constant $C>0$.

We now cover the closure of Δ_δ by finitely many discs $\Delta(z_j,r_j)$, $0\le j\le m$, so that S has a foliation by open Riemann surfaces in a neighborhood U_j of $\Delta(z_j,2r_j)\times\{0\}$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\Delta(z_0,r_0)$ contains the origin. Let $g(t,\zeta)=(g^1(t,\zeta),g^2(t,\zeta))\colon(-1,1)\times\Delta\to S\cap U_0$ be a foliation of $S\cap U_0$. After reparametrization, we may assume that $g(0,0)=0$. Since $g(0,\Delta)\in S$, it follows from (2.1) that $|\operatorname{Re} g^2(0,\zeta)|\le C|\operatorname{Im} g^2(0,\zeta)|^2$. Thus, $g^2(0,\zeta)\equiv 0$ and $g^1(0,\zeta)$ is one-to-one for $\zeta\in\Delta$. Let $a\in(0,1)$ be sufficiently closed to 1 such that $\Delta(z_0,r_0)\subset\subset g^1(0,\Delta_a)$. It is easy to see from Rouché's theorem that $g^1_t(\zeta)=g^1(t,\zeta)$ is one-to-one on Δ_a for sufficiently small t.

Let $\Phi_0(t,\zeta)=(\zeta,\varphi_0(t,\zeta))\colon(-\epsilon_0,\epsilon_0)\times\Delta(z_0,r_0)\to S$ where $\varphi_0(t,\zeta)=g^2_t\circ(g^1_t)^{-1}(\zeta)$ and ϵ_0 is a sufficiently small positive constant. After a reparametrization in t, we may assume that $\Phi_0(t,0)=(0,-r(0,0,t)+it)$. It is clear that $\Phi_0(t,\zeta)$ gives a foliation of S in a neighborhood of $\Delta(z_0,r_0)\times\{0\}$.

We now show how to extend $\Phi_0(t,\zeta)$ to obtain a foliation of S in a neighborhood of $\Delta_\delta\times\{0\}$. Suppose that $\Delta(z_0,r_0)\cap\Delta(z_1,r_1)\ne\emptyset$. Let $p\in\Delta(z_0,r_0)\cap\Delta(z_1,r_1)$. Let $\Phi_1(t,\zeta)=(\zeta,\varphi_1(t,\zeta))\colon(-\epsilon_1,\epsilon_1)\times\Delta(z_1,r_1)\to S$ be defined as in the previous paragraph such that $\Phi_1(t,p)=(p,\varphi_0(t,p))$. Here ϵ_1 is a sufficiently small constant. It follows from the uniqueness of the foliation that $\Phi_0(t,\zeta)=\Phi_1(t,\zeta)$ for $t\in(-\epsilon_0,\epsilon_0)\cap(-\epsilon_1,\epsilon_1)$ and $\zeta\in\Delta(z_0,r_0)\cap\Delta(z_1,r_1)$. Piecing together the foliations of S in a neighborhood of $\Delta(z_j,r_j)\times\{0\}$ in this manner, we obtain a smooth foliation of S in a neighborhood of Δ_δ in a form of

$$\Phi(t,\zeta)=(\zeta,\varphi(t,\zeta))\colon(-\epsilon',\epsilon')\times\Delta_\delta\to S$$

where $\Phi(t,0)=(0,-r(0,0,t)+it)$ and $\epsilon'>0$ is a sufficiently small constant. After a reparametrization in t, we may assume that $\epsilon'=1$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ with piecewise smooth Levi-flat boundary. Let S be one of the defining hypersurfaces of D. Let $\hat D$ be a subdomain of D and let $g\colon\hat D\to bD$ be a holomorphic map. If $g(\hat D)\cap S\ne\emptyset$, then $g(\hat D)\subseteq S$.*

Proof. We assume that g is a non-constant map. Let $M=g(\hat D)\cap S$. Then M is a closed subset of $g(\hat D)$. We now prove that it is also an open subset. Let $p\in M$ and $p=g(q)$ for some $q\in\hat D$. After a change of coordinate system, we may assume that $p=(0,0)$, the leaf of S through p is locally parameterized by $\zeta\mapsto(\zeta,0)$, and S is locally defined by

$$\rho(z,w)=\operatorname{Re} w+\operatorname{Im} w\cdot r(z,\bar z,\operatorname{Im} w)$$

where $r(z,\bar{z},\operatorname{Im} w)=O(|z|+|\operatorname{Im} w|)$. Write $g=(g^1,g^2)$. It follows from $\rho(g^1,g^2)\le 0$ that $\operatorname{Re} g^2(z,w)\le|\operatorname{Im} g^2(z,w)|$ for (z,w) sufficiently closed to q. Since $g^2(q)=0$, it follows from the open mapping property of non-constant holomorphic functions that g^2 is identically zero near q. Since M contains the set $\{(g^1(z,w),0);\ \text{for all } (z,w) \text{ near } q\}$, it is also an open subset of $g(\hat{D})$. Therefore $g(\hat{D})=M\subseteq S$. $\square$

Since the above-mentioned result of Diederich and Fornæss [DF, Theorem 8] plays an important role in this paper, we reformulate it here for reader's convenience.

Theorem 3.3 (Diederich-Fornæss). *Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $M=\Delta\times\{0\}\subseteq bD$. Assume that bD is smooth and pseudoconvex in a neighborhood of M with a local defining function $r=r(z,w)$. Assume further that the outward normal direction of bD at the origin is the positive $\operatorname{Re} w$-axis. Let $v(z)=\arg\frac{\partial r}{\partial w}(z,0)$. Then $v(z)$ defines a harmonic function on Δ. Furthermore, if $u(z)$ is a harmonic conjugate of $v(z)$ and $h(z)=\exp(-u(z)+iv(z))$, then the outward normal of bD is constant on M in the new coordinates (z',w') defined by $z'=z$ and $w'=wh(z)$.*

§4. Proof of the Main Theorem, Part I.

For the rest of the paper, we will use D to denote a simply-connected domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ with generic piecewise smooth Levi-flat boundary and non-compact automorphism group $\operatorname{Aut}(D)$. Let $\{g_k\}\subseteq\operatorname{Aut}(D)$. Suppose that $g_k(q)\to bD$ as $k\to\infty$ for some $q\in D$. After passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $g_k\to g$ local uniformly on D. It follows from Cartan's theorem (cf. [Na1, pp. 78]) that $g\colon D\to bD$.

Let $\mathcal{S}=bD\cap(\cup_{j\neq k}(S_j\cap S_k))$ be the set of singular boundary points. Let $\mathcal{R}=bD\setminus\mathcal{S}$ be the set of regular boundary points.

In this section, we prove the main theorem for the case when $g(D)\cap\mathcal{R}\neq\emptyset$.

Let $p=g(q)\in g(D)\cap\mathcal{R}$. Assume that $p\in S$ where S is one of the defining hypersurfaces of D with defining function ρ. Then there exists a neighborhood U of p so that $D\cap U=\{(z,w)\in U;\ \rho(z,w)<0\}$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that $g(D)\subseteq S$.

Lemma 4.1. *With above notations and conditions, $g\not\equiv$ constant. Furthermore, if $\hat{D}$ is a relatively compact subdomain of D, then $g(\hat{D})$ is a locally closed open Riemann surface.*

Proof. Let $q_j=g_j(q)$ and let p_j be the projection of q_j onto the boundary in the direction of the outward normal of bD at p. Let M_j be the leaf on S that passes through p_j and let v_j be the unit complex tangent vector of M_j at p_j. It is easy to see that

$$\|(g_j^{-1})'(q_j)v_j\| \lesssim F_D^K(q,(g_j^{-1})'(q_j)v_j)=F_D^K(q_j,v_j)\lesssim 1$$

for all j. Let $\tilde{v}_j=(g_j^{-1})'(q_j)v_j/\|(g_j^{-1})'(q_j)v_j\|$. Passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\tilde{v}_j$ converges to a unit vector $\tilde{v}$. Since $|g_j'(q)\tilde{v}_j|\gtrsim 1$, we have that $|g'(q)\tilde{v}|\gtrsim 1$. Therefore $g\not\equiv$ constant.

Let $q'\in\hat{D}$ and $p'=g(q')$. After a change of local coordinate near p', we assume that $p'=(0,0)$, the positive $\operatorname{Re} w$-axis is the outward direction of bD at p', and the leaf of S

through p' is locally parameterized by $\zeta \mapsto (\zeta, 0)$. Let $g = (g^1, g^2)$. It follows from the proof of Lemma 3.2 that g^2 is identically zero in a neighborhood of q'. Therefore $g^1 \not\equiv$ constant. Thus $g(\hat{D}) \cap (\Delta_\epsilon \times \Delta_\epsilon) \supseteq \Delta_\epsilon \times \{0\}$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. It remains to prove that after possible shrinking of ϵ, $g(\hat{D}) \cap (\Delta_\epsilon \times \Delta_\epsilon) = \Delta_\epsilon \times \{0\}$. Suppose that this is not true. Then there exists a sequence $p'_j \in g(\hat{D})$ such that $p'_j \to p'$ and the second coordinate of p'_j is not zero. Let $q'_j \in \hat{D}$ be such that $p'_j = g(q'_j)$. After passing to a subsequence, we assume that $q'_j \to \tilde{q} \in D$. Since $g(\tilde{q}) = p'$, we have again that $g^2(z, w) \equiv 0$ for (z, w) in a neighborhood of $\tilde{q}$. This contradicts to the assumption. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let Ω be a bounded domain such that $M = \Delta \times \{0\} \subseteq b\Omega$ and $S = b\Omega \cap (\Delta \times \Delta_{\epsilon_0})$ is smooth and Levi-flat for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\epsilon > 0$, and $U_{\delta\epsilon} = \Delta_\delta \times \Delta_\epsilon$. Then for any sequence $\{q_j\}$ in Ω that tends to $(0, 0)$,*

$$\overline{\lim_{\epsilon \to 0}}\ \overline{\lim_{j \to \infty}} \frac{M^C_{\Omega \cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j)}{M^E_{\Omega \cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j)} = 1.$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.3, we can choose a coordinate system in a neighborhood of M such that the outward normal of $b\Omega$ is the positive $\operatorname{Re} w$-axis for points on M. Then S is given in a neighborhood of $\Delta_\delta \times \{0\}$ by a defining function of form

$$\rho(z, w) = \operatorname{Re} w + r(z, \bar{z}, \operatorname{Im} w)$$

where $|r(z, \bar{z}, \operatorname{Im} w)| \leq C |\operatorname{Im} w|^2$ for some constant $C > 0$.

Let N_δ be a neighborhood of $\Delta_\delta \times \{0\}$ and $\Phi(t, \zeta) = (\zeta, \varphi(t, \zeta)) \colon (-1, 1) \times \Delta_\delta \to S \cap N_\delta$ be the diffeomorphism constructed in Lemma 3.1.

Write $q_j = (z_j, a_j + ib_j)$. Let $t_j \in (-1, 1)$ satisfy $\varphi(t_j, z_j) = -r(z_j, \bar{z}_j, b_j) + ib_j$. Such t_j is uniquely determined and $t_j \to 0$. It is clear that $L_j = \Phi(t_j, \Delta_\delta)$ is the leaf of through the projection of q_j onto S in the direction of the positive $\operatorname{Re} w$–axis.

Let $v_j(z) = \arg \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial w}(z, \varphi(t_j, z))$ where the argument takes the principal branch. Since $\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial w}(z, 0) = 1/2$ for $|z| < \delta$, $v_j(z)$ is well-defined for sufficiently large j. It follow from Theorem 3.3 that $v_j(z)$ is harmonic. Let $u_j(z)$ be its harmonic conjugate such that $u_j(0) = 0$. Let $h_j(z') = \exp(-u_j(z') + iv_j(z'))$. Let $F_j \colon (z, w) \mapsto (z', w')$ be defined by $z' = z$ and $w' = (w - \varphi(t_j, z))h_j(z)$. Then

$$F_j(\Omega \cap U_{\delta\epsilon}) = \{(z', w');\ \ |z'| < \delta,\ |w'/h_j(z') + \varphi(t_j, z')| < \epsilon,\ \tilde{\rho}(z', w') < 0\}$$

where $\tilde{\rho}(z', w') = \rho(F_j^{-1}(z', w'))$. Since

$$\tilde{\rho}(z', 0) = 0, \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}}{\partial z'}(z', 0) = 0, \text{ and } \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}}{\partial w'}(z', 0) = |\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial w}(z', \varphi(t_j, z'))| e^{u_j(z')} > 0$$

for $|z'| < \delta$, therefore, in the (z', w')-coordinates, $L_j = \Delta_\delta \times \{0\}$ and the outward normal of $b\Omega$ is the positive $\operatorname{Re} w'$-axis for points on L_j. On the other hand, there exists a constant

$C>0$ such that $|\varphi(t_j,z)| \le C|t_j|$ and $1/C \le |h_j(z)| \le C$ for $|z|<\delta$ and sufficiently large j. Therefore, there exist constants $a>0, b>1$ such that

$$\begin{gathered}\Delta_\delta \times \{|w'|<\epsilon/b;\ \operatorname{Re} w' + a|\operatorname{Im} w'|^2 < 0\}\\ \subseteq F_j(\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}) \subseteq\\ \Delta_\delta \times \{|w'|<b\epsilon;\ \operatorname{Re} w' + a|\operatorname{Im} w'|^2 < 0\}\end{gathered}$$

for sufficiently small ϵ and sufficiently large j. Thus for any two angles $\theta_1 \in (0,\pi/2)$ and $\theta_2 \in (\pi/2,\pi)$, we have $\Delta_\delta \times \Gamma_{\theta_1}^{\frac{\epsilon}{b}} \subseteq F_j(\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}) \subseteq \Delta_\delta \times \Gamma_{\theta_2}^{b\epsilon}$ provided ϵ is sufficiently small. Let $q'_j = F_j(q_j)$ and w'_j be the second coordinate of q'_j. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}1 \ge \frac{M^C_{\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j)}{M^E_{\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j)} &\ge \frac{M^C_{\Delta_\delta\times\Gamma^{b\epsilon}_{\theta_2}}(q'_j)}{M^E_{\Delta_\delta\times\Gamma^{\frac{\epsilon}{b}}_{\theta_1}}(q'_j)}\\ &= \frac{M^C_{\Gamma^{b\epsilon}_{\theta_2}}(w'_j)}{M^E_{\Gamma^{\frac{\epsilon}{b}}_{\theta_1}}(w'_j)}.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.2, the last term can be chosen to be as close to 1 as we wish provided $j\to\infty$, $\epsilon\to 0$, $\theta_1 \to (\pi/2)^-$, and $\theta_2 \to (\pi/2)^+$. □

The following lemma is well-known and its proof is elementary.

Lemma 4.3. *Let D be a simply-connected domain. Let D_n be subdomains of D such that $D_j \subset\subset D_{j+1}$ and $\cup_{j=1}^n D_j = D$. Then D_j is also simply-connected for sufficiently large j.*

We are now in position to prove the main theorem in the case when $g(D)\cap\mathcal{R}\neq\emptyset$. The proof uses ideas from our previous work [FW]. We shall keep the notation and setup as at the beginning of this section.

Let D_1 and D_2 be simply-connected subdomains of D such that $q\in D_1\subset\subset D_2\subset\subset D$. Let $V=g(D_2)$. By Lemma 4.1, V is a locally closed open Riemann surface. Since every open Riemann surface is Stein (cf. [Na2, Thm 3.10.13]) and every holomorphic line bundle of an open Riemann surface is trivial (cf. [For, Thm 30.3]), it follows from [Siu, Cor.1] that there exists a biholomorphic mapping Ψ from an open neighborhood W of V to an open neighborhood U of $V\times\{0\}$ in $V\times\mathbb{C}$ such that $\Psi(g(z,w)) = (g(z,w),0)$ for $(z,w)\in D_2$. We may assume that $U\subseteq V\times\Delta$. Let $\pi_1\colon\Delta\to V$ be the universal covering map. Let $\pi(z,w) = (\pi_1(z),w)$. Let $\Omega = \pi^{-1}(\Psi(W\cap D))$. Then

$$\Omega = \{(z',w')\in\Delta\times\mathbb{C};\quad \pi(z',w')\in U,\ \tilde\rho(z',w')<0\}$$

where $\tilde\rho(z',w') = \rho(\Psi^{-1}(\pi(z',w')))$. It is easy to see that $\tilde\rho(z',0) = \frac{\partial\tilde\rho}{\partial z'}(z',0) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial\tilde\rho}{\partial w'}(z',0)\neq 0$. Therefore $b\Omega$ is smooth and hence Levi flat in a neighborhood of $M = \Delta\times\{0\}$.

Fix a preimage $p' \in \pi^{-1}(\Psi(p))$. After a unitary transformation, we may assume that $p' = (0,0)$. Since π is locally one-to-one, there exist unique liftings q_j' of $\Psi(q_j)$ for sufficiently large j such that $q_j' \to p'$. Since D_1 is simply-connected and $g_j(D_1) \subseteq W \cap D$ for sufficiently large j, there exist unique liftings $\tilde{g}_j$ and $\tilde{g}\colon D_1 \to \Omega$ of $\Psi(g_j)$ and $\Psi(g)$ respectively such that $\tilde{g}_j(q) = q_j'$ and $\tilde{g}(q) = p'$. Choose $\delta \in (0,1)$ sufficiently closed to 1 such that $\tilde{g}(D_1) \subset\subset \Delta_\delta \times \{0\}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $U_{\delta\epsilon} = \Delta_\delta \times \Delta_\epsilon$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{M^C_{D_1}(q)}{M^E_D(q)} &\geq \frac{|\det \tilde{g}_j'(q)|^2 M^C_{\tilde{g}_j(D_1)}(q_j')}{|\det g_j'(q)|^2 M^E_D(q_j)} \geq \frac{|\det \tilde{g}_j'(q)|^2 M^C_{\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j')}{|\det g_j'(q)|^2 M^E_D(q_j)} \\ &\geq \frac{|\det \tilde{g}_j'(q)|^2 M^C_{\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j')}{|\det g_j'(q)|^2 M^E_{\pi(\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon})}(q_j)} = \frac{|\det \tilde{g}_j'(q)|^2 M^C_{\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j')}{|\det \tilde{g}_j'(q)|^2 |\det \pi'(q_j')|^2 M^E_{\pi(\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon})}(q_j)} \\ &\geq \frac{M^C_{\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j')}{M^E_{\Omega\cap U_{\delta\epsilon}}(q_j')}\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.2, $M^C_{D_1}(q)/M^E_D(q) \geq 1$. Since we can exhaust D by relatively compact simply-connected subdomains (Lemma 4.3), we obtain that $M^C_D(q)/M^E_D(q) \geq 1$. It then follows from Lemma 2.1(4) that D is biholomorphic to the bidisc. □

§5. Proof of the Main Theorem, Part II.

In this section, we prove the main theorem when $g(D) \cap \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$.

Let $p = g(q) \in g(D) \cap \mathcal{S}$. Then there exists a neighborhood U of p such that $U \cap D = \{(z,w) \in U; \quad \rho_1 < 0, \rho_2 < 0\}$ where ρ_1 and ρ_2 are functions in a defining system of D. Let S_1 and S_2 be the corresponding defining hypersurfaces. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that $g(D) \subseteq S_1 \cap S_2$. Since $\partial\rho_1(p)$ and $\partial\rho_2(p)$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$, after an affine linear transformation, we may assume that $p = (0,0)$, $\partial\rho_1(p) = (0,1)$, and $\partial\rho_2(p) = (1,0)$.

Lemma 5.1. *The boundary point p is a local peak point of D.*

Proof. Assume that the leaves L_1 and L_2 of the foliations of S_1 and S_2 through p are given locally by $\varphi(\zeta) = (\varphi_1(\zeta), \varphi_2(\zeta))$ and $\psi(\zeta) = (\psi_1(\zeta), \psi_2(\zeta))$ respectively. After reparametrization, we may assume that $\varphi(0) = \psi(0) = p$, $\varphi'(0) = (1,0)$, and $\psi'(0) = (0,1)$. After a change of coordinates of form $(z,w) \mapsto (z',w')$ where $z' = z - \psi_1(\psi_2^{-1}(w))$ and $w' = w - \varphi_2(\varphi_1^{-1}(z))$, we may assume that L_1 and L_2 are given locally by $\Delta_{\delta_1} \times \{0\}$ and $\{0\} \times \Delta_{\delta_2}$ respectively. Thus, S_1 and S_2 are defined by

$$\operatorname{Re} w + \operatorname{Im} w \cdot O(|z| + |\operatorname{Im} w|) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{Re} z + \operatorname{Im} z \cdot O(|w| + |\operatorname{Im} z|) = 0$$

respectively. After possible shrinking of U, we have

$$D \cap U \subseteq \{\operatorname{Re} w - |\operatorname{Im} w| < 0\} \times \{\operatorname{Re} z - |\operatorname{Im} z| < 0\}.$$

Let $f_p(z,w) = \exp(-(-z)^{\frac{2}{3}} - (-w)^{\frac{2}{3}})$ where the cubic root takes the principal branch. Then f_p is a local peak function at p. □

It follows from the maximal principle that bD is variety free at p. Therefore $g(D) = \{p\}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $U_\epsilon = \Delta_\epsilon \times \Delta_\epsilon$. Then for any sequence $\{q_j\}$ in D that tends to p,*

$$\overline{\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}}\ \overline{\lim_{j\to\infty}} \frac{M^C_{D\cap U_\epsilon}(q_j)}{M^E_{D\cap U_\epsilon}(q_j)} = 1.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.2 in nature. We first project q_j to the defining hypersurfaces S_1 and S_2. We then construct a new coordinate system such that the leaves through the projections of q_j are discs on the coordinate planes and the outward normal of bD is constant for points on each leaf. We then compare the invariant measures of $D \cap U_\epsilon$ with those of a product of two cones. We provide details as follows.

As in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we can choose a coordinate system in a neighborhood of p such that the leaves of the foliations of S_1 and S_2 through p are locally given by $L^1 = \Delta_{\epsilon_0} \times \{0\}$ and $L^2 = \{0\} \times \Delta_{\epsilon_0}$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$. By Theorem 3.3, we can further assume that the outward normal of S_1 is the positive $\operatorname{Re} w$-axis for points on L^1 and the outward normal direction of S_2 is the positive $\operatorname{Re} z$-axis for points on L^2. For $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, let $\Phi(t,\zeta) = (\zeta, \varphi(t,\zeta))$ be the diffeomorphism from $(-1,1)\times\Delta_\epsilon$ onto a neighborhood of $\Delta_\epsilon\times\{0\}$ on S_1 as constructed in Lemma 3.1. Choose t_j such that $t_j \to 0$ and $L^1_j = \Phi(t_j, \Delta_\epsilon)$ is the leaf of the foliation of S_1 that passes through the projection of q_j onto S_1 in the direction of the positive $\operatorname{Re} w$-axis. Let $v^1_j(z) = \arg \frac{\partial\rho_1}{\partial w}(z, \varphi(t_j, z))$. By Theorem 3.3, $v^1_j(z)$ is harmonic on Δ_ϵ. Let $u^1_j(z)$ be its harmonic conjugate such that $u^1_j(0) = 0$. Let $h^1_j(z) = \exp(-u^1_j(z) + iv^1_j(z))$. Define $F^1_j\colon (z,w) \to (z',w')$ by $z' = z$ and $w' = (w - \varphi(t_j,z))h^1_j(z)$. Let $\tilde\rho_1(z',w') = \rho_1((F^1_j)^{-1}(z',w'))$ and $\tilde\rho_2(z',w') = \rho_2((F^1_j)^{-1}(z',w'))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde\rho_1(z',0) = 0,\quad \frac{\partial\tilde\rho_1}{\partial z'}(z',0) = 0,\quad \frac{\partial\tilde\rho_1}{\partial w'}(z',0) = \left|\frac{\partial\rho_1}{\partial w}(z',\varphi(t_j,z'))\right| e^{u_j(z')} > 0;\\
\tilde\rho_2(0,w') = 0,\quad \frac{\partial\tilde\rho_2}{\partial w'}(0,w') = 0,\quad \frac{\partial\tilde\rho_2}{\partial z'}(0,w') = \frac{\partial\rho_2}{\partial z}(0, w'/h^1_j(0) + \varphi(t_j,0)) > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for $|z'| < \epsilon$ and $|w'/h^1_j(0) + \varphi(t_j,0)| < \epsilon_0$. Therefore, in the (z',w')-coordinates, $L^1_j = \Delta_\epsilon\times\{0\}$ and the outward normal of S_1 is the positive $\operatorname{Re} w'$-axis for points on L^1_j. Moreover, $L^2 = \{(0,w');\ |w'/h^1_j(0) + \varphi(t_j,0)| < \epsilon_0\}$ and the outward normal of S_2 is the positive $\operatorname{Re} z'$-axis for points on L^2.

Since $h^1_j(0) \to 1$ and $\varphi(t_j,0) \to 0$, $F^1_j(L^2) \supseteq \{(0,w');\quad |w'| \le \epsilon\}$ and $\Delta_\epsilon \times \Delta_{\epsilon/2} \subseteq F^1_j(U_\epsilon) \subseteq \Delta_\epsilon \times \Delta_{2\epsilon}$ for sufficiently large j.

Now let $\Psi(s,w')$ be the diffeomorphism from $(-1,1)\times\Delta_\epsilon$ onto a neighborhood of $\{0\}\times\Delta_\epsilon$ on $F^1_j(S_2)$ as constructed in Lemma 3.1. Choose s_j such that $s_j \to 0$ and $L^2_j = \Psi(s_j, \Delta_\epsilon)$ is the leaf of the foliation of $F^1_j(S_2)$ that passes through the projection of q_j onto S_2 in the direction of the positive $\operatorname{Re} z'$-axis. Let $v^2_j(w') = \arg \frac{\partial\rho_2}{\partial z'}(\psi(s_j,w'),w')$. Let $u^2_j(w')$ be its harmonic conjugate on Δ_ϵ such that $u^2_j(0) = 0$. Let $h^2_j(w') = \exp(-u^2_j(w') + iv^2_j(w'))$. Define $F^2_j\colon (z',w') \to (z'',w'')$ by $z'' = (z' - \psi(s_j,w'))h^2_j(w')$ and $w'' = w'$. Let

$\hat{\rho}_1(z'', w'') = \rho_1((F_j^2)^{-1}(z'', w''))$ and $\hat{\rho}_2(z'', w'') = \rho_2((F_j^2)^{-1}(z'', w''))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\rho}_1(z'', 0) = 0,\ \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}_1}{\partial z''}(z'', 0) = 0,\ \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}_1}{\partial w''}(z'', 0) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_1}{\partial w'}(z''/h_j^2(0) + \psi(s_j, 0), 0) > 0; \\
&\hat{\rho}_2(0, w'') = 0,\ \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}_2}{\partial w''}(0, w'') = 0,\ \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}_2}{\partial z''}(0, w'') = |\frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_2}{\partial z'}(\psi(s_j, w'), w')| e^{u_j^2(w')} > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for $|z''/h_j^2(0) + \psi(s_j, 0)| < \epsilon$ and $|w''| < \epsilon$. Therefore, in the (z'', w'')-coordinates, L_j^1 and L_j^2 are discs on coordinate planes and the outward normal of S_1 (and S_2) is the positive $\operatorname{Re} w''$-axis ($\operatorname{Re} z''$-axis respectively) for points on L_j^1 (L_j^2 respectively). Let $F_j = F_j^2 \circ F_j^1$. Then for sufficiently large j, $\Delta_{\epsilon/2} \times \Delta_{\epsilon/2} \subseteq F_j(D \cap U_\epsilon) \subseteq \Delta_{2\epsilon} \times \Delta_{2\epsilon}$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{gathered}
\{|z''| < \epsilon/2;\ \operatorname{Re} z'' + C|\operatorname{Im} z''|^2 < 0\} \times \{|w''| < \epsilon/2;\ \operatorname{Re} w'' + C|\operatorname{Im} w''|^2 < 0\} \\
\subseteq F_j(D \cap U_\epsilon) = \{(z'', w'') \in F_j(U_\epsilon);\ \ \hat{\rho}_1(z'', w'') < 0, \hat{\rho}_2(z'', w'') < 0\} \subseteq \\
\{|z''| < 2\epsilon;\ \operatorname{Re} z'' - C|\operatorname{Im} z''|^2 < 0\} \times \{|w''| < 2\epsilon;\ \operatorname{Re} w'' - C|\operatorname{Im} w''|^2 < 0\}
\end{gathered}$$

for sufficiently large j. Thus for any two angles $\theta_1 \in (0, \pi/2)$ and $\theta_2 \in (\pi/2, \pi)$, we have $\Gamma_{\theta_1}^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \times \Gamma_{\theta_1}^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \subseteq F_j(\Omega \cap U_\epsilon) \subseteq \Gamma_{\theta_2}^{2\epsilon} \times \Gamma_{\theta_2}^{2\epsilon}$ provided ϵ is sufficiently small. Let $q_j'' = (z_j'', w_j'') = F_j(q_j)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
1 \geq \frac{M^C_{\Omega \cap U_\epsilon}(q_j)}{M^E_{\Omega \cap U_\epsilon}(q_j)} &\geq \frac{M^C_{\Gamma_{\theta_2}^{2\epsilon} \times \Gamma_{\theta_2}^{2\epsilon}}(q_j'')}{M^E_{\Gamma_{\theta_2}^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \times \Gamma_{\theta_1}^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}}(q_j'')} \\
&= \frac{M^C_{\Gamma_{\theta_2}^{2\epsilon}}(z_j'')}{M^E_{\Gamma_{\theta_1}^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}}(z_j'')} \cdot \frac{M^C_{\Gamma_{\theta_2}^{2\epsilon}}(w_j'')}{M^E_{\Gamma_{\theta_1}^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}}(w_j'')}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.2 that the last term can be chosen to be as close to 1 as we wish provided $j \to \infty$, $\epsilon \to 0$, $\theta_1 \to (\pi/2)^-$, and $\theta_2 \to (\pi/2)^+$, the lemma is now proved. □

We now prove the main theorem in this case. We use the notation and setup at the beginning of the section. Let $q \in D$ and $q_j = g_j(q)$. Let D_1 be relatively compact subdomain of D containing q. For any $\epsilon > 0$, since $g(D) = \{p\}$, $g_j(D_1) \subseteq D \cap U_\epsilon$ for sufficiently large j. Therefore, by Lemma 2.1

$$\frac{M^C_{D_1}(q)}{M^E_D(q)} = \frac{M^C_{g_j(D_1)}(q_j)}{M^E_D(q_j)} \geq \frac{M^C_{D \cap U_\epsilon}(q_j)}{M^E_{D \cap U_\epsilon}(q_j)}.$$

By Lemma 5.2, $M^C_{D_1}(q)/M^E_D(q) \geq 1$. Exhausting D by D_1, we have $M^C_D(q)/M^E_D(q) \geq 1$. It then follows from Lemma 2.1 (4) that D is biholomorphic to the bidisc. Note that in this part of the proof the simply-connected condition on D is not needed. □

References

[BaF] D. Barrett and J. Fornaess, *On the smoothness of Levi-foliations*, Publ. Mat. **32** (1988), 171-177.

[BP1] E. Bedford and S. Pinchuk, *Domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$ with non-compact automorphism groups*, Math. USSR-Sb **63** (1989), 145–151.

[BP2] E. Bedford and S. Pinchuk, *Convex domains with non-compact automorphism group*, Mat. Sb. **185** (1994), 3-26.

[CS] B. Coupet and A. Sukhov, *On the boundary rigidity phenomenon for automorphisms of domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$*, Proceedings of the AMS **124** (1996), 3371-3380.

[DF] K. Diederich and J. Fornaess, *Pseudoconvex domains: an example with nontrivial nebenhülle*, Math. Ann. **225** (1977), 275-292.

[For] O. Forster, *Lectures on Riemann Surfaces*, Springer-Verlag, 1981.

[Fra] S. Frankel, *Complex geometry with convex domains that cover varieties*, Acta Math. **163** (1989), 109–149.

[Fre] M. Freeman, *Local complex foliation of real manifolds*, Math. Ann. (1974), 1-30.

[FIK] S. Fu, A. Isaev, and S. Krantz, *Reinhardt domains with non-compact automorphism groups*, Math. Research Letters **3** (1996), 109–122.

[FW] S. Fu and B. Wong, *On boundary accumulation points of a smoothly bounded pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$*, Math. Ann. (to appear).

[GW1] I. Graham and H. Wu, *Characterizations of the unit ball B^n in complex Eulcidean space*, Math. Z. **189** (1985), 449-456.

[GW2] ———, *Some remarks on the intrinsic measures of Eisenman*, Trans. of the AMS **288** (1985), 625-660.

[GK1] R. Greene and S. Krantz, *Characterizations of certain weakly pseudoconvex domains with non-compact automorphism groups*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1268, pp. 121–157.

[GK2] ———, *Biholomorphic self-maps of domains*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1276, 1987, pp. 136-207.

[GK3] ———, *Techniques for studying automorphisms of weakly pseudoconvex domains*, Several Complex Variable: Proc. of the Mittag-Leffler Institute (J.E. Fornaess, eds.), Princeton University Press, 1993, pp. 389–410.

[JP] M. Jarnicki and P. Pflug, *Invariant distances and metrics in complex analysis*, Walter de Gruyter, 1993.

[Kim1] K.-T. Kim, *Domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with a piecewise Levi flat boundary which possess a noncompact automorphism group*, Math. Ann. **292** (1992), 575–586.

[Kim2] ———, *Geometry of bounded domains and the scaling techniques in several complex variables*, Lecture Notes Series, 13, Seoul National University, 1993.

[Kob] S. Kobayashi, *Hyperbolic manifolds and holomorphic mappings*, Marcel Dekker Inc., 1970.

[Kod1] A. Kodama, *On the structure of a bounded domain with a special boundary point*, Osaka J. Math. **23** (1986), 271-298.

[Kod2] ———, *On the structure of a bounded domain with a special boundary point, II*, Osaka J. Math. **24** (1987), 499-519.

[Kr] S. Krantz, *Function theory of several complex variables*, John Wiley and Sons, 1982.

[Na1] R. Narasimhan, *Several complex variables*, The University of Chicago, 1971.

[Na2] ———, *Analysis on Real and Complex Manifolds*, North-Holland, 1985.

[P] S. Pinchuk, *Homogeneous domains with piecewise-smooth boundaries*, Math. Notes **32** (1982), 849-852.

[R] J. P. Rosay, *Sur une characterization de la boule parmi les domains de $\mathbb{C}^n$ par son groupe d'automorphismes*, Ann. Inst. Four. Grenoble **29** (1979), 91–97.

[Siu] Y.-T. Siu, *Every Stein subvariety admits a Stein neighborhood*, Inventiones Math. **38,** (1976), 89–100.

[W1] B. Wong, *Characterization of the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^n$ by its automorphism groups*, Invent. Math. **41** (1977), 253–257.

[W2] B. Wong, *Characterization of the bidisc by its automorphism group*, Amer. J. of Math. **117** (1995), 279–288.

Department of Mathematics, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX 77840
E-mail address: `sfu@ math.tamu.edu`

Department of Mathematics, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521
E-mail address: `wong@ math.ucr.edu`